

Appl. No. 10/825,718  
Reply dated January 6, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 8, 2005

REMARKS

The present application and its claims are directed to a cleaning system, method and device. Claims 1-30 were pending and claims 2-3, 8-10, 14-19 and 23-28 have been amended, no claim have been added, claims 20-21 have been cancelled so that claims 1-19 and 22-30 are currently pending.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicant requests that the examiner consider the prior art cited in the IDS that accompanies this response.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Applicant has amended claims 2-3 and 8 to overcome the examiner's objection to these claims.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In response to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,130,104 to Yamasaka (hereinafter "Yamasaka") and claims 13-15, 17-19, 22-24 and 26-30 under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,118,290 to Sugiyama et al. (hereinafter "Sugiyama"), Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as the claims are not anticipated by Yamasaka or Sugiyama for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 20-21

Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 20-21 were rejected based on Yamasaka. In the rejection, the examiner states that "...the working surface (2) has a characteristic that permits the prober (17) to determine the location of the working surface (2) of the cleaning pad (4)." The claimed working surface is the working surface 89 shown in Figure 9 that is top surface of the cleaning device. The claimed working surface has a particular characteristic that permits a prober to automatically detect the working surface of the cleaning device.

Yamasaka has a skin film 2A (see Figure 1A or 1B) that is most similar to the claimed working surface. However, as set forth in Yamasaka, the skin film 2A has a very smooth surface. See Col. 8, lines 17-25 of Yamasaka and in particular Col. 8, lines 23-4. As set forth in the application at page 8, lines 26-29, a typical substrate with a mirror finish does not permit the prober

Appl. No. 10/825,718  
Reply dated January 6, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 8, 2005

to determine the location of the working surface due to the reflectivity of the substrate. Similarly, the skin film 2A of Yamasaka does not have any working surface characteristic, such as a matte finish, texture or morphology, that permits a prober to detect the skin film 2A of the cleaner 1 of Yamasaka. In fact, Yamasaka does not even discuss the skin film surface nor what characteristics that skin film has. Finally, Yamasaka also does not disclose that locating the skin film 2A by a prober is a problem nor that the skin film 2A should have a particular characteristic to permit the skin film (the working surface) to be detected by a prober. Therefore, Yamasaka does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 10 (directed to a working surface having a characteristic to permit the prober to determine the location of the working surface of the cleaning pad) nor independent claim 8 directed to a working surface having a matte finish to permit the prober to determine the location of the working surface of the cleaning pad. Yamasaka also does not anticipate the claims that depend from claims 1, 8 and 10.

Claims 13-15, 17-19, 22-24 and 26-30

Claims 13-15, 17-19, 22-24 and 26-30 were rejected based on Sugiyama. In the rejection, the examiner states, for claims 13 and 22, that Sugiyama discloses “automatically determining the location of the working surface of the cleaning device (20) based on a characteristic of the working surface....” Yamasaka discloses a cleaner tool 20 that does in fact have a working surface that faces up towards the probe 17A. However, Sugiyama does not disclose that the working surface of the cleaner tool 20 has a particular characteristic that permits the prober 17A to detect the cleaner tool 20. In fact, like Yamasaka, Sugiyama does not even discuss the working surface of the cleaner tool 20 nor that the working surface of the cleaner tool 20 has any particular characteristics. Finally, Sugiyama also does not disclose that locating the cleaner tool 20 by the prober 17A is a problem nor that the cleaner tool 20 working surface should have a particular characteristic to permit the working surface to be detected by a prober. Therefore, Sugiyama does not anticipate independent claims 13 and 22 (directed to automatically detecting a working surface having a characteristic to permit the prober to determine the location of the working surface of the cleaning device) Sugiyama also does not anticipate the claims that depend from claims 13 and 22.

Appl. No. 10/825,718  
Reply dated January 6, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 8, 2005

Claims 9, 16 and 25

Applicant has amended these claims to make them independent as the examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The claims which depend from these claims (claims 17-19, 23-24 and 26-28) are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-19 and 22-30 are allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner and early allowance of these claims and the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number below in order to speed the prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: 1-6-06

By 

Timothy W. Lohse  
Reg. No. 35,255  
Attorney for Applicant

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP  
2000 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Telephone: (650) 833-2055